

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Advances in Applied Mathematics

www.elsevier.com/locate/yaama

When excluding one matroid prevents infinite antichains

Natalie Hine, James Oxley^{*,1}

Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 19 October 2009

Accepted 26 October 2009

Available online 5 December 2009

Keywords:

Infinite antichain

Minor-closed class

Excluded minor

ABSTRACT

Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle have announced that there are no infinite sets of binary matroids none of which is isomorphic to a minor of another. In this paper, we use this result to determine precisely when a minor-closed class of matroids with a single excluded minor does not contain such an infinite antichain.

© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The matroid terminology used here will follow Oxley [9]. For a matroid N , let $EX(N)$ denote the class of matroids having no minor isomorphic to N . Tutte [12] proved that $EX(U_{2,4})$ is the class of binary matroids. Robertson and Seymour [11] proved a conjecture of Wagner that there are no infinite antichains of graphs. They also conjectured, though apparently not in print [4,5], that, for all prime powers q , this theorem can be extended to the class of matroids representable over $GF(q)$. Geelen, Gerards, and Whittle [6] have announced that they have proved this conjecture for $q = 2$; that is, under the minor ordering, $EX(U_{2,4})$ does not contain an infinite antichain. This theorem prompts the question as to precisely when $EX(N)$ does not contain an infinite antichain. The purpose of this note is to answer this question. The following theorem is our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Under the minor ordering, $EX(N)$ does not contain an infinite antichain if and only if N is a minor of $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{1,3}$ or $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,3}$.*

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: nhine1@math.lsu.edu (N. Hine), oxley@math.lsu.edu (J. Oxley).

¹ This author was supported by the National Security Agency.

2. Infinite antichains

The proof that certain classes $EX(N)$ contain infinite antichains will use three examples of such antichains.

Example 2.1. For all $n \geq 3$, let P_n be the rank-3 matroid consisting of a ring of n three-point lines, that is, P_n has ground set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ and its only non-spanning circuits are $\{x_1, y_1, x_2\}, \{x_2, y_2, x_3\}, \dots, \{x_n, y_n, x_1\}$. The set $\{P_n: n \geq 3\}$ is an infinite antichain [2, p. 155].

Example 2.2. For all $k \geq 2$, let T_k be the matroid that is obtained by taking the direct sum of two k -element circuits and truncating this to rank k . Oxley, Prendergast, and Row [10] proved that the set $\{T_k: k \geq 2\}$ is an infinite antichain.

Example 2.3. For all $r \geq 2$, let N_r be the tipless binary spike of rank $2r$, that is, the vector matroid of the matrix $[I_{2r} | J_{2r} - I_{2r}]$ over $GF(2)$ where J_{2r} is the $2r \times 2r$ matrix of all ones. Let M_r be a matroid obtained from N_r by relaxing a pair of complementary circuit-hyperplanes. Kahn (in [9, p. 471]) proved that the set $\{M_r: r \geq 2\}$ is an infinite antichain no member of which has a $U_{2,5}$ - or $U_{3,5}$ -minor.

A binary relation \leq on a set Q is a *quasi-order* if it is reflexive and transitive. A *well-quasi-order* is a quasi-order such that, for every infinite sequence q_1, q_2, \dots of members of Q , there are indices i and j such that $i < j$ and $q_i \leq q_j$. For example, the set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers under the usual ordering is a well-quasi-order. If \mathcal{M} is a class of matroids that is closed under isomorphism and minors, then \mathcal{M} is a quasi-order under the minor relation \leq_m . The examples above show that, when \mathcal{M} is the class of all matroids, (\mathcal{M}, \leq_m) is not a well-quasi-order. This paper determines precisely when $(EX(N), \leq_m)$ is a well-quasi-order.

For a quasi-order (Q, \leq) , let $Q^{<w}$ be the set of all finite sequences of members of Q . For (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m) and (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) in $Q^{<w}$, define $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m) \leq^{<w} (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ if there are indices i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq n$ such that $p_j \leq q_{i_j}$ for all j in $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Higman [7] proved the following fundamental result.

Lemma 2.4. If (Q, \leq) is a well-quasi-order, then $(Q^{<w}, \leq^{<w})$ is a well-quasi-order.

Let $(Q_1, \leq_1), (Q_2, \leq_2), \dots, (Q_k, \leq_k)$ be quasi-orders. For (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k) and (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k) in $Q_1 \times Q_2 \times \dots \times Q_k$, define $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k) \leq (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k)$ if $p_j \leq_j q_j$ for all j in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. As noted, for example, in [3], the following is a well-known consequence of Lemma 2.4.

Corollary 2.5. If (Q_i, \leq_i) is a well-quasi-order for all i in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, then $(Q_1 \times Q_2 \times \dots \times Q_k, \leq_1 \times \leq_2 \times \dots \times \leq_k)$ is a well-quasi-order.

Let M be a uniform matroid with ground set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. Replace each element x_i by k_i parallel elements for some $k_i \geq 1$ where if $r(M) = 0$, each $k_i = 1$. We call the resulting matroid a *parallel extension* of a uniform matroid. Its dual is a *series extension* of a uniform matroid. Note that this terminology differs from Oxley [9] where parallel and series extensions require the addition of a single element.

Lemma 2.6. There are no infinite antichains of series extensions of uniform matroids.

Proof. Associate the pair $(r, s-r)$ and the s -tuple (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s) with $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \dots \leq k_s$ to each series extension of a non-empty uniform matroid $U_{r,s}$. From above, $\mathbb{N}^2 \times \mathbb{N}^{<w}$ is a well-quasi-order. Thus the class of series extensions of uniform matroids is a well-quasi-order. \square

3. $EX(N)$

In the next lemma, \mathcal{W}^3 denotes the rank-3 whirl, while Q_6 and P_6 are obtained from \mathcal{W}^3 by relaxing one and two circuit-hyperplanes, respectively.

Lemma 3.1. *The class $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$ consists of direct sums of binary matroids and series extensions of uniform matroids.*

Proof. Let $M \in EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$. Assume M is 3-connected. Observe that $M \in EX(\mathcal{W}^3, Q_6, P_6)$. Thus, by [8, Theorem 1.5], M is binary or uniform. Now assume M is connected, but not 3-connected. Then $M = M_1 \oplus_2 M_2$ for some connected matroids M_1 and M_2 . Suppose M is non-binary. Then, without loss of generality, M_1 is non-binary. Hence, M_1 has a $U_{2,4}$ -minor. Furthermore, Bixby [1] proved that every element of M_1 , so, in particular, the basepoint p of the 2-sum, is in a $U_{2,4}$ -minor of M_1 . Thus, no cocircuit of M_2 containing p has more than two elements. Hence, M_2 is a circuit. Thus, every 2-sum decomposition of M has a circuit as one part. It follows without difficulty that M is a series extension of a uniform matroid, and it is straightforward to complete the proof of the lemma. \square

Corollary 3.2. *The classes $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$ and $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,3})$ do not contain infinite antichains.*

Proof. By duality, it suffices to prove the result for $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$. If $M \in EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$, then, by the previous lemma, we can write M as $M_0 \oplus M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_k$ for some $k \geq 0$ where M_0 is binary and every other M_i is a series extension of a uniform matroid. Note that we shall allow M_0 to be $U_{0,0}$. Let Q_B denote the class of binary matroids and let Q_S denote the class of series extensions of uniform matroids. By [6] and Lemma 2.6, neither Q_B nor Q_S contains any infinite antichains. By Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.5, $Q_B \times Q_S^{<w}$ is a well-quasi-order. Thus $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3})$ is a well-quasi-order. \square

We now prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume $EX(N)$ contains an infinite antichain. Then, by Corollary 3.2, N is not a minor of $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3}$ or $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,3}$.

Assume N is not a minor of $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{1,3}$ or $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,3}$, so $|E(N)| \geq 3$. If $r(N) \geq 4$ or $r(N^*) \geq 4$, then $EX(N)$ contains $\{P_n: n \geq 3\}$ or $\{P_n^*: n \geq 3\}$, respectively. Hence, $r(N) \leq 3$ and $r(N^*) \leq 3$. Thus $|E(N)| \leq 6$. Observe that $EX(U_{0,2} \oplus U_{1,1})$ and $EX(U_{2,2} \oplus U_{0,1})$ contain $\{P_n: n \geq 3\}$ and $\{P_n^*: n \geq 3\}$, respectively; both $EX(U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,2})$ and $EX(U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,4})$ contain $\{T_k: k \geq 4\}$; and $EX(U_{3,5})$ and $EX(U_{2,5})$ contain $\{M_r: r \geq 2\}$ and $\{M_r^*: r \geq 2\}$, respectively. Hence we may assume that N has no minor isomorphic to $U_{0,2} \oplus U_{1,1}$, $U_{2,2} \oplus U_{0,1}$, $U_{1,2} \oplus U_{1,2}$, $U_{2,5}$, $U_{3,5}$, or $U_{2,4} \oplus_2 U_{2,4}$. It is not difficult to check that this leaves no remaining choices for N . \square

References

- [1] R.E. Bixby, I -matrices and a characterization of non-binary matroids, *Discrete Math.* 8 (1974) 139–145.
- [2] T.H. Brylawski, *Constructions*, in: N. White (Ed.), *Theory of Matroids*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986, pp. 127–223.
- [3] G. Ding, B. Oporowski, J. Oxley, On infinite antichains of matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 63 (1995) 21–40.
- [4] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, G. Whittle, Towards a structure theory for matrices and matroids, in: *International Congress of Mathematicians*, vol. III, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 827–842.
- [5] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, G. Whittle, Towards a matroid-minor structure theory, in: G. Grimmett, C. McDiarmid (Eds.), *Combinatorics, Complexity, and Chance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. 72–82.
- [6] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, G. Whittle, Binary matroid minors II, Talk by J. Geelen, in: *Applications of Matroid Theory and Combinatorial Optimization to Information and Coding Theory*, Banff, August, 2009.
- [7] G. Higman, Ordering by divisibility in abstract algebras, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 2 (1952) 326–336.
- [8] J. Oxley, A characterization of certain excluded-minor classes of matroids, *European J. Combin.* 10 (1989) 275–279.
- [9] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.
- [10] J. Oxley, K. Prendergast, D. Row, Matroids whose ground sets are domains of functions, *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A* 32 (1982) 380–387.
- [11] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, Graph minors. XX. Wagner's Conjecture, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 92 (2004) 325–357.
- [12] W.T. Tutte, A homotopy theorem for matroids, I, II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 88 (1958) 144–174.